

# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 480

32

EA 003 713

TITLE Annual State Report: ESEA, Title I, 1970.  
 INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston.  
 Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education.  
 REPORT NO Pub-No-268  
 PUB DATE 70  
 NOTE 80p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community  
 Involvement, \*Compensatory Education, Delinquent  
 Rehabilitation, \*Disadvantaged Youth, \*Federal  
 Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education,  
 Parent Participation, \*Program Evaluation, Retarded  
 Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher  
 Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS \*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA  
 Title I, Massachusetts

## ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Massachusetts State Department of Education; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. A related document is EA 003 715. (EA)

ED053480

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY



*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
*Department of Education*

# Annual Evaluation Report, Title I, ESEA Fiscal Year 1970

EA 003 713

ANNUAL STATE REPORT

ESEA, TITLE I

1970

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION  
182 Tremont Street  
Boston, Massachusetts

Publication No. 268  
Publication of this document  
approved by Alfred C. Holland  
State Purchasing Agent

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Department of Education

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mrs. Rae Cecilia Kipp  
Chairman

John S. Sullivan  
Vice-Chairman

Richard L. Banks  
Walter N. Borg  
Ramona L. Corriveau  
William P. Densmore  
J. Richard Early

Allan R. Finlay  
William H. Gassett  
Joseph Salerno  
Joseph G. Weisbert

Secretary: Neil V. Sullivan  
Commissioner of Education

Ex Officiis: Edward C. Moore, Chancellor  
Board of Education

William C. Gaige, Research Director  
Advisory Council on Education

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Neil V. Sullivan

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Thomas J. Curtin

ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER

Max Bogart

BUREAU OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Lawrence M. Bongiovanni    Director  
John P. Schomer            Acting Assistant Director

Robert L. Jeffery	Project Director, Title I, ESEA
Blanche M. Martin	Senior Supervisor
Daniel A. McAllister	Senior Supervisor
Arthur E. Mignault	Senior Supervisor
Clare M. Walsh	Senior Supervisor
Kathleen M. Brennick	Supervisor
Joseph A. Yannacci	Senior Field Accountant

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
MASSACHUSETTS BASIC STATISTICS	1
STATE EDUCATION AGENCY STAFF VISITS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES	12
CHANGES IN STATE EDUCATION AGENCY PROCEDURES AND POLICIES	15
EFFECT ON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT	21
EFFECT UPON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES	51
ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED	55
PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS	57
TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS AND AIDES	62
COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT	69

## MASSACHUSETTS BASIC STATISTICS

Two hundred and twenty-five (225) Massachusetts school districts responded to the Title I School District Report for the fiscal year 1970. Of these respondents thirty (30) or thirteen percent (13%) were school districts serving an urban community, one hundred and fifteen (115) or fifty-one percent (51%) serve a suburban community, and seventy-one (71) or thirty-one percent (31%) serve a rural community in the state. The total population served by these schools is as follows:

<u>Population of School District</u>			<u>% of School Districts</u>
Less than	-	5,000	30
5,000	-	25,000	54
25,000	-	75,000	13
75,000	-	125,000	3
125,000	-	250,000	1
Over	-	250,000	1

Of the districts which responded one hundred and eighty-one (181) had children participating in Title I Projects during the summer of 1970, while one hundred and twenty-three (123) of these districts had children who participated in Title I Projects operated during the school year 1969-1970.

One hundred and eighty-nine (189) of the school districts which responded to the School District Report indicated participation in at least one Title I Project as a fiscal agent. Forty-seven (47) districts participated in more than one (ranging from two (2) to nine (9) project as a fiscal agent, while nineteen (19) school districts participated in at least one Title I project as a cooperating LEA (but not the fiscal agent).

A total of three hundred and eighteen (318) Massachusetts LEA's were involved in Title I activities during the past year. These LEA's included two hundred and eighty-six (286) projects operated by a single LEA and thirty-two (32) projects which involved cooperative LEA's.

TABLE 1-1  
Unduplicated Count of Participating Pupils  
N = 225 School Districts Reporting

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
Preschool	2,904
Kindergarten	4,766
1	10,706
2	10,669
3	11,963
4	8,209
5	7,344
6	6,613
7	2,023
8	1,264
9	724
10	644
11	409
12	321
Special Education	726
Drop-outs	94
Other	450
Total	<u>69,824</u>

Table 1 represents the total number of students both public and nonpublic participating in Title I programs in the state.

TABLE 1-2  
Number of Public and Nonpublic School Pupils  
Participating in Title I Programs  
N = 225 School Districts for Public Schools  
N = 97 School Districts for Nonpublic Schools

Public School Total	57,607
Nonpublic School Total	<u>12,217</u>
Total	<u>69,824</u>



The total number of public school pupils reported participating in Title I programs represents eighty-two percent (82%) of the participants, with seventeen percent (17%) represented as nonpublic school children. Forty-three percent (43%) of the school districts reported nonpublic school pupils participating during the FY 1970. Of the students participating in the Title I programs seventy percent (70%) were involved in programs for pre-school through fourth grade pupils. Grades five and six had nineteen percent (19%) of the participating pupils while seven percent (7%) were enrolled in grades seven through twelve. This represents a definite effort on the part of the operating LEA's to concentrate their efforts on the pre-school and lower grade pupils in their programs.

The tables which follow represent the percent of school districts with a given number of students enrolled in a particular grade.

TABLE 1-3  
Pre-School

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	24%
51 - 100	12%
101 - 200	36%
201 - 500	24%
501 - 1000	4%

Total Number of Students = 2,904

TABLE 1-4

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	19%
51 - 100	23%
101 - 200	39%
201 - 500	15%
501 - 1000	4%

Total Number of Students = 4,766

TABLE 1-5  
First Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	22%
51 - 100	25%
101 - 200	41%
201 - 500	9%
501 - 1000	2%
1001 - 5000	1%

Total Number of Students = 10,706

TABLE 1-6  
Second Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	24%
51 - 100	28%
101 - 200	38%
201 - 500	8%
501 - 1000	1%
1001 - 5000	1%

Total Number of Students = 10,669

TABLE 1-7  
Third Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	22%
51 - 100	29%
101 - 200	38%
201 - 500	8%
501 - 1000	2%
1001 - 5000	1%

Total Number of Students = 11,963

TABLE 1-8  
Fourth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	26%
51 - 100	28%
101 - 200	36%
201 - 500	8%
501 - 1000	2%

Total Number of Students = 8,209

TABLE 1-9  
Fifth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	25%
51 - 100	27%
101 - 200	37%
201 - 500	9%
501 - 1000	2%

Total Number of Students = 7,344

TABLE 1-10  
Sixth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	22%
51 - 100	25%
101 - 200	42%
201 - 500	9%
501 - 1000	2%

Total Number of Students = 6,613

TABLE 1-11  
Seventh Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	17%
51 - 100	26%
101 - 200	40%
201 - 500	17%

Total Number of Students = 2,023

TABLE 1-12  
Eighth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	8%
51 - 100	22%
101 - 200	50%
201 - 500	20%

Total Number of Students = 1,264

TABLE 1-13  
Ninth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	5%
51 - 100	24%
101 - 200	43%
201 - 500	28%

Total Number of Students = 724

TABLE 1-14  
Tenth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	0
51 - 100	28%
101 - 200	43%
201 - 500	24%
501 - 1000	5%

Total Number of Students = 644

TABLE 1-15  
Eleventh Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	6%
51 - 100	19%
101 - 200	44%
201 - 500	31%

Total Number of Students = 409

TABLE 1-16  
Twelfth Grade

<u>Number of Students Participating</u>	<u>Percent of School Districts</u>
1 - 50	23%
51 - 100	23%
101 - 200	31%
201 - 500	23%

Total Number of Students = 321



## STATE EDUCATION AGENCY STAFF VISITS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

State Education Agency staff visits were made to local education agencies to provide the local agency with assistance in the development and operation of their projects. The purpose and adequacy of the assistance given by the SEA staff is summarized in Table 2-1. The four most frequent needs for which SEA staff assistance is solicited are in understanding the intent of Title I, in interpreting Title I Federal and State guidelines, and in helping the LEA to identify its needs and then to plan a program to meet these needs.

Table 2-2 presents an indication of the areas in which the Local Education Agency felt the SEA staff had been of "most" and of "least" assistance to their Title I program. The N in Table 2-2 represents only those LEA's which responded by marking one area of "most" or "least" assistance. Some of the LEA's marked the SEA staff of "most" assistance in several or all of the indicated areas. The most frequently marked area of "most" assistance (67) was in interpreting Title I Federal and State regulations and guidelines.

TABLE 2-1

Purpose and Adequacy of SEA Staff Assistance  
to Local Education Agency

Purpose of Assistance		Number of LEA's Receiving Assistance	Percent of Assistance Rated Adequate by LEA
I.	Aiding LEA to understand the intent of Title I	170	99%
II.	Assisting LEA in interpreting Title I Federal and State regulations and guidelines in terms of their own community situations	172	99%
III.	Helping LEA to identify its needs and set educational priorities	106	97%
IV.	Helping LEA to plan project activities that would meet their needs effectively	126	92%
V.	Helping LEA to solve problems related to program operations	94	89%
VI.	Helping LEA to plan evaluations appropriate for their assessment needs	144	85%
VII.	Other	14	64%

TABLE 2-2

Rating of Areas of Assistance by SEA to LEA's  
Title I Program

Purpose of Assistance	Most Assistance		Least Assistance	
	N	%	N	%
I. Understanding the intent of Title I	44	29%	3	2%
II. Interpreting Title I Federal and State regulations and guidelines	67	45%	4	3%
III. Needs assessment	3	2%	23	16%
IV. Program Planning	15	10%	20	14%
V. Program Operation	1	0.6%	41	29%
VI. Evaluation	19	13%	41	29%
VII. Other	1	0.6%	10	7%

CHANGES IN STATE EDUCATION AGENCY  
PROCEDURES AND POLICIES

To Improve the Quality of Title I Projects:

Much needed supervisory staff has been added to the Title I Office. In the fall of 1968, the original staff of two full-time professionals was enlarged to three full-time members. During the winter of 1969, a fourth full-time supervisor joined the staff, and in the spring, 1970, a fifth full-time supervisor came aboard. With an additional supervisor joining the staff during winter, 1971, the Title I Office has been brought to its present operating force of 6 professionals. A state salaried supervisor was assigned to Title I for an extended period of time to work particularly with bilingual education projects. In addition, during Fiscal year 1969, the SEA employed a part-time person for an average of six days a month to assist in the collection and compilation of evaluation materials, in the preparation of reports and various federal and state surveys, and in the provision of workshops of evaluation for local project personnel.

This increase in Title I personnel has given the SEA staff more time to spend with local project directors in all phases of project development and operation. It

has permitted more individual attention to local problems, more site visits to operating projects, more time for review of applications and evaluation materials, and more time to provide for dissemination, workshops, and consideration of long-range state program activities. There is, however, a need for still more supervisory staff if all of the over four hundred projects operated each year are to be given adequate attention. There is also a need for full-time staff with primary responsibilities in the areas of evaluation and dissemination.

The SEA has continued to implement the following policies initiated during Fiscal Year 1968 through 1971.

1. In the early years of the Title I program, some projects, especially those operated after the regular school day or on weekends, tended to be excessively general. The SEA therefore required that projects have specific substantive goals and that in after-school and weekend projects each candidate for participation be given diagnostic tests to identify his deficiencies and strengths. Only if the project was designed to meet his particular needs was a child to be included.
2. The SEA strongly recommended that Title I projects with major objectives concerning attitude and adjustment provide a team diagnosis for each participating child prior to, during,

and after his participation in the project. The suggested diagnostic team included a guidance counselor, clinical psychologist, teacher, and medical professional. The diagnosis itself was to include observations and objective measures relevant to the behavioral changes that the project was designed to encourage.

3. Summer projects were to include provisions for a late follow-up on project participants during the school year and for coordination between summer activities and the regular school program. All LEA's conducting summer projects were advised to hold meetings early in the school year at which summer project staff could explain summer activities to the school term teachers and pass on pupil information such as test data and progress reports accumulated during the summer.

4. A supplementary budget sheet was instituted in FY 68 and required of all applicants. This budget format permits line item categories in the Title I project application budget to be broken down in greater detail.

5. The SEA continues to sponsor workshops and conferences for local project staff on topics pertinent to their project activities. During FY 69, two workshops were held on reading activities for the elementary grades, five on the use of fine arts in the curriculum for the disadvantaged, and four on teaching English as a second language.

6. Local education agencies were to reduce the number of children served by Title I projects so that, rather than offer diffuse and ineffective services to a large number of children, fewer children would receive more intensive attention. Each local district was advised, as an index, to expend Title I funds at a per pupil rate that approached half of its per pupil expenditure from local funds.

In making project services more intensive, local project planners were urged to provide comprehensive services for Title I participants including guidance, home-school counseling, diagnostic testing, and health care. When social and economic factors contribute to a child's inability to achieve academically, it is important to work with the causes as well as the symptoms.

7. Unless a local education agency could document strongly that its highest priority educational needs were those of junior high school students, Title I projects were to concentrate upon serving children in the elementary grades and to give consideration to pre-school and first grade transition programs. In fiscal year 1969, 55% of projects and fiscal year 1970, 72% of the projects concentrated their services at the preschool through third grade level. The Title I

staff has developed a statement that clearly spell out the 1971-72 priorities for the development of services at the early childhood level (preschool to grade 3).

8. In the spring of 1969, the SEA prepared and distributed a booklet, Title I in Review, which contained summaries of all school term projects. The booklet was sent to local education agencies to provide them with information about the content of other Massachusetts Title I projects. In the spring of 1970, the current year summaries of all school term projects were distributed to local education agencies. In addition to the preceding, the SEA also prepared and distributed a booklet 1971 Title I Syllabus which contained a digest of current regulations, review of procedures and SEA priorities.

9. To facilitate a more effective administration of Title I services, a member of our staff attended a highly concentrated two-day training session at the U.S. Office of Education in Washington, D.C.

10. To further intensify effective supervision of projects, a team approach to reviewing and approving all applications was instituted in fiscal year 1971. To augment this service, a definite procedure is in affect to include other department specialist in the planning and visitation of projects.



11. In the four major cities, a committee composed of University faculty, department specialist and regional office staff, will visit projects to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the learning experiences. Recommendations for improving the instructional level will be shared with the Local Education Agency.

12. In order to insure the full participation of parents in the planning, implementation and evaluations of educational programs for their children, State guidelines for parent involvement were established. To insure representativeness of parents whose children are receiving Title I service, the elective procedure was mandated by the Department of Education. (see attached guidelines) Five regional workshops were conducted to orient local project coordinators and school staff to the intent and operational features of the Guidelines.

13. Title I staff members schedule regular visitation days at each regional office to consult with local communities in developing their projects.

14. As a means of establishing accountability in Title I programs, the National Education Program Associates, Inc. are developing a program validation system which will incorporate a revised application form and periodic activity report to substantiate the attainment of performance goals.

## EFFECT ON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

This section presents a discussion of the effects Title I has had upon the reading achievement of educationally deprived children in Massachusetts. This discussion is based upon the standardized achievement test results included in Part I - the Title I Project Report - of the Annual ESEA Title I Report for Fiscal Year, 1970.

Although the data included in the Project Reports indicate to some extent the effect of Title I on reading achievement, the data also impose several limitations on conclusions drawn about the educational achievement of Title I program participants. Because no statewide testing program exists to insure the administration of the same tests in all programs, and because the rigor of the standardized testing programs for the Title I projects varies, the standardized scores reported in the Annual Title I report are neither complete for each project nor uniform across projects. Some projects did not administer standardized tests; most projects did not report all data the Title I Project report required; very few projects reported useful control group data. Therefore, this analysis of the effect of Title I on reading achievement is based on data from projects as shown in Table 4-1.

TABLE 4-1  
Projects Used for Determining Title I  
Reading Achievement

Number of Projects		Number of Tested Participants	
School Year 69-70	Summer 70	School Year 69-70	Summer 70
46	61	12,516	4405

The enumeration shown in Table 4-1 is not a complete accounting of all Title I programs with reading programs. It counts, with one exception, only those projects which reported data from standardized tests which included the mean grade equivalent for both the pre-tests and post-tests. The number of tested participants on whom usable data were available represents approximately 24% of all Title I participants.

In order to determine the effect of Title I on reading achievement, a systematic, but not statistical, analysis of the standardized test results reported in the Annual Project reports was undertaken. The projects enumerated in Table 1 were divided into five descriptive categories for the purpose of this report only; no attempt has been made to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the various programs. The first group of projects, Descriptive Category One, was

comprised of those where the gain in the mean grade equivalent score from pre-test to post-test was at least one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing, plus at least an additional five-month gain which brought the students to at most one month below their appropriate grade level at the time of the post-testing. The second category of projects, Descriptive Category Two, included those where the gain in mean grade equivalent score from pre-test to post-test was at least one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing, plus at least an additional five month gain which did not bring the students to within one month of their appropriate grade level at the time of the post-testing. A third group of projects, Descriptive Category Three, is described as including those where the students gained at least one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing and an additional one to four month gain. Descriptive Category Four projects were those whose participants gained one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing. The remaining projects, those in Descriptive Category Five, were those in which the participants gained less than one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing

and post-testing, plus at least an additional five month gain which did not bring the students to within one month of their appropriate grade level at the time of the post-testing. The remaining projects, those in Descriptive Category Five, were those in which the participants gained less than one month for every month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing. It should be noted that many projects could be described in more than one way because projects often resulted in differential gains for students in different grade levels. Table 4-2 shows the number of projects classified into each descriptive category; some projects are counted in more than one category.

TABLE 4-2

## Categories of Gains in Reading Achievement

Descriptive Category One		Descriptive Category Two		Descriptive Category Three		Descriptive Category Four		Descriptive Category Five	
School Year	Summer Year	School Year	Summer Year	School Year	Summer Year	School Year	Summer Year	School Year	Summer Year
8	7	9	23	32	46	15	21	35	31

The following narrative discusses the projects which belong to each of these five categories. School year projects and summer projects are discussed separately.

Descriptive Category One: School Year Projects

The following programs for the grades indicated in parentheses can be described as showing at least a five-month gain beyond expected for the testing interval with the post-test scores within one month of grade level: Arlington (for grades 2, 3, 4), Ashland (for grades 7, 8), Cohasset (for grade 2), Essex-Manchester (for grades 3, 4), Grafton (for grades 9, 10), Granville (for grades 2, 3), Rockport (for grade 7), and Sturbridge (for grade 2). Table 4-3 shows the gain in mean

grade equivalent scores beyond one month for each month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing.

TABLE 4-3

Gain in Mean Grade Equivalent Scores Beyond Expected Gain for Descriptive Category One School Year Projects

Project	Grade	Number Tested		Months Gained Beyond Expected
		Pre	Post	
Arlington	2	36	36	7
	3	25	25	9
	4	20	19	7
Ashland	7	5	5	10
	8	6	6	11
Cohasset	2	12	12	6
Essex-Manchester	3	12	12	9
	4	9	9	6
Grafton	9	9	5	22
	10	1	1	18
Granville	2	1	1	5
	3	1	1	11
Rockport	7	47	47	13
Sturbridge	2	4	4	6

All of these programs met during the regular school day. Each of these Descriptive Category One school year programs, except Grafton, offered individual instruction and tutoring. All programs, except Granville and Sturbridge, provided small group instruction. Arlington, Ashland, Exxes-Manchester, and Rockport also engaged in curriculum revision. Ashland, Cohasset, Essex-Manchester, and Sturbridge provided individual counseling; Arlington, Ashland, Cohasset, Essex-Manchester, Rockport, and Sturbridge did diagnostic testing.

Although these school year programs had some common program characteristics, they differed markedly in the number of participants, staff size, and budget. Table 4-4 reports these data for the programs mentioned above.



TABLE 4-4  
Student, Staff, and Budget Statistics for  
Descriptive Category One School Year  
Programs

Project	Number of Students	Staff		Expended Budget	Per Pupil Cost*
		Full Time	Part Time		
Arlington	191	8	19	\$33,401.00	\$174.87
Ashland	70	2		9,534.00	136.20
Cohasset	12	1	1/2	8,016.00	668.00
Essex-Manchester	52	1		8,920.00	171.54
Grafton	54	5	1	12,948.69	159.86
Granville	5		2	672.00	134.40
Rockport	102	1		7,066.00	69.27
Sturbridge	86	2	5	24,498.00	284.86

\* Per Pupil Cost = Expended budget/Number of Students

As indicated by Table 4-4 the pupil to staff ratio varies greatly for these eight projects as does the per pupil cost. It is also important to reiterate that these programs could be classified as Category One programs for only certain grades; the reasons for these differential gains generally cannot be deduced from the ESEA Annual Project Report; referral to the detailed evaluations of individual projects, which

are not available for all projects, is necessary for understanding these differences.

#### Descriptive Category One: Summer Programs

The summer programs listed in Table 4-5 can be classified in Descriptive Category One for those grades listed; this classification is based on the criteria listed above. Table 5 also includes the number of months gained beyond that expected for the given pre-testing and post-testing interval.

TABLE 4-5

Gain in Mean Grade Equivalent Scores  
Beyond Expected Gain for  
Descriptive Category One

Project	Grade	Number Tested		Months Gained Beyond Expected
		Pre	Post	
Ashburnham	K	16	18	15 below mdn. on pre, 17 in 4th quartile on post
Burlington	4	14	13	7
Dennis	2	11	11	9
	4	9	9	7
Foxboro	6	20	19	13
Leicester	6	4	4	12
Newbury	5	5	5	6
Salisbury	6	6	4	11*

\*Refers to average of gains on more than one subtest

All of these summer programs offered small group instruction. Burlington, Foxboro, Leicester, and Salisbury provided individual instruction and tutoring, while all programs, except Newbury and Leicester, had individualized instruction. Each project, except Newbury and Leicester, secured new teaching materials and/or new teaching equipment. Burlington was the only Descriptive Category One summer project which did not include field trips. Ashburnham and Dennis had counseling for individual students; only Burlington did not give diagnostic tests. All programs, except Burlington and Dennis, had parent conferences.

Descriptive Category One summer programs had organizational and program content similarities. The size and budget of the programs, however, varied greatly. Table 4-6 summarizes the pupil and staff size for these programs and each program's budget.

TABLE 4-6

Student, Staff, and Budget Statistics for  
Descriptive Category One Summer Programs

	Number of Students	Staff		Expended Budget	Per Pupil Cost*
		Full Time	Part Time		
Ashburnham	18	1		\$ 2,520.00	\$140.00
Burlington	52	10		11,280.24	216.93
Dennis	57	16		12,068.92	211.74
Foxboro	56	12		8,087.60	144.42
Leicester	75	13		10,554.84	140.73
Newbury	30	4	1	4,689.00	156.30
Salisbury	107	22	1	18,976.37	177.35

\* Per Pupil Cost = Expended Budget/Number of Students

Although the per pupil cost and the student to staff ratio varies greatly in these summer projects, these factors do not seem to have a direct effect on the gains in achievement scores. It is interesting to note that the Ashburnham budget only supported a teacher aide; the large gain of students in this program is, therefore, quite interesting. Again, as for the Descriptive Category One of school year programs, it should be noted that these projects show differential gains for different grade levels of students.

### Descriptive Category Two: School Year Programs

Nine school year programs were classified in Descriptive Category Two for at least one grade level of students. Table 3-7 summarizes the descriptive data on these projects.

TABLE 4-7  
Description of Category Two  
School Year Programs

Gain in Months Beyond Expected	Number of Projects	Grades	Number of Students*
5	3	4,6,7	33
6	1	6	4
7	3	6 (2), 7	29
8	1	5	9
10	1	7	21
11	1	3	1
16	1	5	14
21	1	8	6

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

Approximately 117 students were involved in school year projects which belong to Descriptive Category Two. In all but one case, these students were in grades 4-7. Although these students gained at least five months in excess of the

gain expected for the pre-testing and post-testing interval, the post-test mean grade equivalent scores were still not at grade level.

Some of the programs shown as belonging to Descriptive Category Two in Table 3-7 were also classified as belonging to Descriptive Category One for certain grades as shown in Table 4-5. Therefore, this suggests that no specific qualities differentiate the programs in Descriptive Category One from those in Descriptive Category Two.

#### Descriptive Category Two: Summer Programs

According to the criteria detailed above, twenty-three summer programs were rated as being in Descriptive Category Two for at least one grade of students in the project. Some of these programs are classified in Descriptive Category One for certain grades; some are rated as belonging in Descriptive Category Three for other grades; some are classified in Descriptive Category Four for one or more grades. Tables 3-8 provides a description of the summer programs in Descriptive Category Two.

TABLE 4-8  
Description of Category Two  
Summer Programs

Gain in Months Beyond Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
5	10	K-2, 2(2), 3(3), 5 (2), 6, 7	162
6	7	2, 3(3), 4, 5-6, 5(2), 6(2), 7	268
7	3	3-5, 4, 7	75
8	4	3, 5, 6, 7, 8	21
9	4	2, 5(2), 6	110

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

Six hundred thirty-six students were in programs classified in Descriptive Category Two for their grade levels. All grade levels were represented in Descriptive Category Two. Although students in these summer programs gained between five and nine months beyond what was expected for their grade level, the post-test mean grade equivalent score was still not sufficiently high to be at grade level for the participants.

Descriptive Category Three: School Year Programs

Table 4-9 describes those school year projects which were classified in Descriptive Category Three.

TABLE 4-9  
Description of Category Three  
School Year Programs

Gain in Months Beyond Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
1	13	2(5), 3(6), 4(4), 5(3), 6(2), 7(2), 8	1839
2	13	1, 2(3), 3(2), 4(5), 5(2), 6(2), 7, 8(2)	502
3	13	2(4), 3(3), 5(4), 6(2), 8, 9	398
4	6	1, 2(2), 5, 7	200

\* Refers to number of students who took post-tests

The thirty-two school year projects which were classified in Descriptive Category Three served 2939 students in grades where a gain in mean grade equivalent scores from the pre-testing to the post-testing was between one and four months beyond what was expected for the given testing interval. In examining data



from large cities, some grades in Boston, Brockton, and New Bedford projects were included in this classification. This was the greatest gain in achievement scores for any grade in these large cities' programs. It should be reiterated that only certain grades in the Descriptive Category Three projects can be classified in such a way. On the basis of this fact, it is evident that these programs do not possess any unique characteristics that can be identified as contributing to the students' achievement gains. Within a project, the grade level of the students seem to be the most significant factor for differentiating the descriptive categories of projects; no pattern of grade level classification, however, has been evident across projects.

#### Descriptive Category Three: Summer Programs

Forty-five summer programs were classified in Descriptive Category Three for at least one grade. Descriptive data on these projects are included in Table 4-10.

TABLE 4-10  
Description of Category Three  
Summer Programs

Gains in Months Beyond Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
1	25	1(11), 2(5), 3(2), 4(3), 5, 6(4), 7(3)	652
2	21	1(4), 2(8), 3(13), 4(5), 5, 6(4), 8	741
3	19	1, 2(4), 3(7), 4(5), 5(6), 6, 7, 8	487
4	10	1, 2(3), 3, 4, 5(3), 6(2), 7, 9	130

\*Refers to number of students who took post tests

Table 4-10 suggests that 2010 pupils displayed a gain in mean grade equivalent scores of between one and four months beyond what was expected on a standardized reading test for the given testing interval. It should be noted that this is the first category -- Descriptive Category Three -- in which first grades, 17 in number, are included to any noticeable extent. Because many of these projects also are classified into at least one of the three

other categories, it seems reasonable to conclude that these Descriptive Category Three summer programs do not as a group possess any unique characteristics.

Descriptive Category Four: School Year Programs

Fifteen school year programs were classified in Descriptive Category Four for students in certain grades. The mean gain in achievement test scores for these participants was one month for each month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing. Table 4-11 presents the descriptive statistics for these Category Four School Year programs.

TABLE 4-11

Description of Category Four School  
Year Programs

Number of Months Below Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
0	15	2(3), 3(5), 4, 5(5), 6(2), 8(2), 9(2)	1535

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

Projects in Descriptive Category Four for some grades were classified into other descriptive categories for other grades; this suggests that Descriptive Category Four programs did not possess any unique qualities which explain the achievement gain for groups in this category. The 1535 students who participated in Descriptive Category Four school year programs were in a variety of grades, as shown in Table 4-11. Therefore, a particular grade level was not uniquely classified in Descriptive Category Four.

Descriptive Category Four: Summer Programs

Those summer programs which were classified into Descriptive Category Four are described in Table 4-12.

TABLE 4-12  
Description of Category Four  
Summer Programs

Number of Months Below Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
0	21	1(6), 2(8), 3(4), 4(3), 5(4), 8	341

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

Three hundred forty-one students participated in summer programs which were classified in Descriptive Category Four for their grade level. These were programs where students at a particular grade level gained one month in their grade equivalent achievement score for each month which elapsed between the pre-testing and post-testing. Because many of these programs were also classified into other descriptive categories, it seems possible to conclude that the Descriptive Category Four summer programs did not possess any unique qualities.

#### Descriptive Category Five: School Year Programs

Many projects were classified in Descriptive Category Five for students in certain grades. This means that the gain between pre-testing and post-testing was less than one month for each month which elapsed between these testings. It is possible however, that the gains would have been even smaller without participation in Title I programs; the lack of control group data prevents any conclusions from being drawn in this area. Table 4-13 describes these school year programs.

TABLE 4-13  
Description of Category Five School  
Year Programs

Number of Months Below Expected	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
1	13	1, 2(4), 3(2), 4(5), 5, 6(2)	1040
2	18	1, 2(2), 3(2), 4(8), 5(5), 6(3), 7, 8, 11	3935
3	11	2(2), 3(3), 4(4), 5, 6(2)	1242
4	5	1-2, 3, 3-4, 5, 6(2)	1054
5 and below	12	1, 3(3), 4(4), 5(3), 6(3), 7(4), 7-8, 8(2)	471

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

The thirty-five school programs in Descriptive Category Five for certain grades included 7742 students. The inclusion of programs at some grades from the large Massachusetts cities of Boston and Brockton contributes to this high number.

Descriptive Category Five: Summer Programs

Table 4-14 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the Descriptive Category Five.

TABLE 4-14  
Description of Descriptive Category Five  
Summer Programs

Number of Months Below Expected Gain	Number of Projects	Grade Levels	Number of Students*
1	21	1(5), 1-2, 2(7) 3(5), 4(4), 5(2), 5-6, 6(2), 7	664
2	16	1(2), 1-2, 2(3), 2-3(2), 3(3), 3-4, 3-5, 4(3), 5(2), 6(4), 7-8	510
4	3	1, 2-3(2)	80
5 and below	7	1, 4(3), 5(4), 6(2)	81

\*Refers to number of students who took post-tests

Students in all grade levels participated in Descriptive Category Five summer programs. These 1335 students demonstrated gains in the mean grade equivalent score between the pre-testing and post-testing of less than one month for every month which elapsed between the

two testings. Since some programs in Descriptive Category Five for some grades were in Descriptive Category One for other grades, again it seems evident that the Descriptive Category Five programs did not possess any common qualities that contributed to their limited gain in achievement scores.

#### Information from Control Group Data

Control group data was reported by very few projects in the Annual Title I Project Reports. A review of those cases where control group data was presented revealed the following information. Five school year projects and one summer project reported control group data. Tables 4-15, 4-16, and 4-17 give three examples of projects for which control group data was reported.



TABLE 4-15  
Control Group Comparisons  
Project A

Grade of Students	Gain of Experimental Group	Gain of Control Group
2	1 below expected	2 below expected
3	3 above expected	at expected level
4	2 below expected	3 below expected
5	3 above expected	4 below expected
6	3 below expected	3 below expected

In Project A, a school year project, a review of the gains of the experimental and control groups as shown in Table 4-15 suggests that the experimental group made greater gains than the control group at most grade levels. In the school year project cited in Table 4-16 below this does not seem to be the case.

TABLE 4-16  
Control Group Comparisons  
Project B

Grade of Students	Gain of Experimental Group	Gain of Control Group
1	4 above expected	1 above expected
2	1 below expected	1 below expected
3	7 below expected	5 below expected
4	1 below expected	2 below expected
5	8 below expected	4 below expected
6	9 below expected	at expected level
7	5 below expected	5 below expected
8	8 below expected	9 below expected

In the case of Project B the difference in gains between the experimental and control groups is not consistent. Table 4-17 shows the gains for a summer project, which supplied control group data in the Project Report.

TABLE 4-17  
Control Group Comparisons  
Project C

Grade of Students	Gain of Experimental Group	Gain of Control Group
2-3	4 below expected	5 below expected
4-5	2 below expected	5 below expected

In the case of Project C, as in Project A, the experimental group seems to have made greater gains as a result of participation in Title I. But the incompleteness of the control group data for those projects who reported these data prevents any definitive comparisons between the experimental and control groups, the lack of standard deviations of the scores, and the absence of other data, prevent a statistical comparison of the gains of these two groups. The results cited for Projects A, B, and C, however, suggest that no consistent difference between Title I and control group gains does exist; the difference depends on the individual project and particular grade level being discussed.

### Conclusions

The previous narrative suggests that the Title I projects for Fiscal Year 1970 had differential, and not consistent, effects on the Title I population. This population includes both public and non-public school students; no distinction is made in the previous discussion between these two groups. Tables 4-18 and 4-19 summarize the description of Title I projects in Massachusetts by indicating the number and percent of Title I participants in the school year and summer programs who were included in each of the five categories discussed above; these were only those students who took standardized reading tests which yielded analyzable results.

TABLE 4-18

Number of Project Participants in Each  
School Year Descriptive Category

	Descriptive Category One	Descriptive Category Two	Descriptive Category Three	Descriptive Category Four	Descriptive Category Five
N	183	117	2939	1535	7742
%	1.5	0.9	23.5	12.3	61.9

TABLE 4-19

Number of Project Participants in Each  
Summer Descriptive Category

	Descriptive Category One	Descriptive Category Two	Descriptive Category Three	Descriptive Category Four	Descriptive Category Five
N	83	636	2010	341	1335
%	1.9	14.4	45.6	7.7	30.3

Tables 4-18 and 4-19 above suggest that many of the program participants participated in projects which had a limited impact on reading achievement. These tables are biased, however, by the large number of students who participated in projects in large cities such as Boston, Brockton, and New Bedford; these programs showed limited gains in reading achievement. Tables 4-20 and 4-21 attempt to eliminate this bias by indicating the number and percent of Title I projects which were included in each of the five categories discussed above. It should be noted that the same project may be placed in more than one category; the total number of projects is the sum of projects in each category and may include a project more than once.

TABLE 4-20

Number of School Year Projects in Each  
Descriptive Category

	Descriptive Category One	Descriptive Category Two	Descriptive Category Three	Descriptive Category Four	Descriptive Category Five
N	8	9	32	15	35
%	8.1	9.1	32.3	15.2	35.4

TABLE 4-21

Number of Summer Projects in Each  
Descriptive Category

	Descriptive Category One	Descriptive Category Two	Descriptive Category Three	Descriptive Category Four	Descriptive Category Five
N	7	23	46	21	31
%	5.5	18.0	35.9	16.4	24.2

Tables 4-20 and 4-21 indicate that 64.6% of the school year projects and 75.8% of the summer programs were in Categories One, Two, Three, and Four; these projects showed mean gains in reading achievement of at least one month for every month between pre and post-testing.

No consistent differences seem to exist in programs of different descriptive categories; generally one project was placed into several categories depending on the grade level of the students being considered.

The qualities of Descriptive Category One were discussed but because some of these programs were placed in more than one category depending on the grade level of the students, it seems reasonable to conclude that these programs did not differ distinctly from projects placed in other descriptive categories. A review of each program at each grade level would be necessary to explain the achievement gains in a project; this analysis is not within the scope of this report because the information required for such an analysis is not detailed in the Title I Project Report.

The statistics cited in Tables 4-4 and 4-6 also suggest that the per pupil expenditure does not have a definite link to the classification of a program. The programs in Descriptive Category One differ markedly in their per pupil expenditure. Many of these programs were also placed in additional categories; therefore, no definite distinction can be made between the various categories in terms of per pupil expenditure; all categories have a wide range of per pupil expenditure.

THE EFFECT OF TITLE I UPON ADMINISTRATIVE  
STRUCTURES AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

Local Education Agencies:

Table 5-1 presents a summary of the effects of Title I programs upon local educational practices as reported by project directors in Part II of the final reports for the fiscal year 1970. The extent to which Title I funds have served as spring boards allowing school systems to initiate new activities and modes of instruction which were later assumed by local budgets is reflected in items 1 through 4. Items 5 through 7 suggest that methods, materials, and curricular innovations brought about by Title I funds are influencing the total curriculum, even though the items do not reflect the extent of the influence in these areas. Items 9 through 11 reflect the interest of Non-Title I staff in working with and learning more about the educationally disadvantaged.



TABLE 5-1

The Effects of Title I Programs Upon the  
Educational Practices and Climates in  
Local Educational Agencies

N = 188 Programs

Effects Reported	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
1. Activities initiated under Title I have been taken over by local funds.	71	37.76
2. Activities initiated under Title I will be taken over by local funds in the fiscal year 1971.	39	20.74
3. Activities initiated under Title I have been expanded with local funds to include other children.	104	55.31
4. Types of personnel initially added under Title I have now been added to serve other children as well.	108	57.44
5. Materials developed for use in Title I projects are being used with other children as well.	166	53.70
6. Teaching methods initiated in Title I projects are being adopted more generally.	135	71.80
7. Curriculum revision geared to the disadvantaged child has spread to other areas of curriculum.	98	52.12

TABLE 5-1 (Continued)

The effects of Title I Programs Upon the  
Educational Practices and Climates in  
Local Educational Agencies

	Effects Reported	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
8.	Parents have become more involved in the school program.	65	34.57
9.	Non-Title I teachers have requested to participate in Title I projects.	96	51.06
10.	Non-Title I teachers have joined Title I staff training programs.	42	22.34
11.	Non-Title I teachers are now taking professional courses in the field of teaching the disadvantaged.	58	30.85
12.	Other	31	16.48

Nonpublic Schools:

Thirty-three percent (32.97%) of the school districts reported that they "don't know" what effect Title I has had upon the non-public schools in their district, while seventeen percent (17.55%) reported no effect upon the non-public schools. However, non-public school teachers participated

in Title I staff training programs in eight percent (7.97%) of the fiscal year 1970 projects and seventeen percent (17.02%) requested to participate in Title I projects.

-54-

ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE  
DISADVANTAGED

A. State Funds and Programs:

Currently there are no state-funded compensatory programs in Massachusetts for the educationally disadvantaged.

B. Coordination with other Federally Funded Programs:

Some fiscal year 1970 Title I projects were operated in conjunction with other federally-funded programs.

TABLE 6-1

Coordination with Other Federally-Funded  
Programs

N = 297 Projects

Program	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
ESEA Title II	44	14.81%
ESEA Title III	19	6.39%
Headstart and/or Follow Through	14	4.71%

In general, those projects coordinated with Title II funds received materials, library books, and equipment through Title II. In planning the implementation of Title II many of

the reading teachers have worked with school librarians to indicate areas of interest to Title I children. Other Title I projects have used and benefited from audio-visual aids purchased under Title II.

Equipment such as overhead projectors, record players, and tape recorders purchased with ESEA Title III funds have been used for class presentations by Title I projects. Some of the projects coordinated with Title III received in-service assistance in the form of personnel from ESEA Title III who conducted teacher workshops, while others received assistance from ESEA Title III personnel for both workshops and field trips. Headstart helped by sharing expenses for transportation and field trips.

## PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

To ensure that nonpublic school children are given the opportunity to participate in Title I activities, the SEA requires written verification from local education agencies that local nonpublic school officials have been notified of Title I plans and that eligible nonpublic school students have been invited to participate. Those LEA's not planning to include eligible nonpublic school children must provide satisfactory explanations of why nonpublic school students are not participating.

Forty-seven percent (47%) of all projects contributing data for this report included nonpublic school children in their Title I activities. Information on the participation of nonpublic school children in Title I projects is summarized in Table 7-1. Tables 7-2 and 7-3 present a duplicated tally of the number of nonpublic school student participants according to time and to location of their participation.

Table 7-4 presents a summary of the ways in which staff members of nonpublic schools were involved in Title I project activities.

TABLE 7-1

Extent of Participation of Nonpublic School  
Children in Title I Projects  
N =251 Projects Responding

Extent	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
1. All eligible nonpublic school children participated.	53	21%
2. Some eligible nonpublic school children participated.	66	26%
3. Total projects in which non-public school children participated (#1 and #2).	119	47%
4. None of the eligible nonpublic school children participated.	63	25%
5. Total projects in which non-public school children were eligible to participate (#3 and #4).	182	72%
6. No nonpublic school children were eligible to participate.	69	27%

TABLE 7-2  
Nonpublic School Student Participation  
According to Place

Location	Number of Projects	Total
Public School Grounds	87	2201
Nonpublic School Grounds	31	1802
Both	7	561
Other	13	210

TABLE 7-3  
Nonpublic School Student Participation  
According to Time

Time	Number of Projects	Total
During the School Day	51	3010
Before School	5	11
After School	3	117
Weekends	6	48
Summer Session	67	1853



TABLE 7-4

Participation of Nonpublic School  
Representatives in Title I Projects

Type of Involvement	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
In planning project design	88	29.6%
In planning curriculum and materials	24	8.1%
In project instruction and services	35	11.8%
In staff training	20	6.7%
In evaluation	61	20.5%
Other	63	21.2%

Many of the school districts in their efforts to involve non-public school children in their Title I projects sent letters of invitation to the non-public schools. These letters contained information about the program and asked for a listing of eligible pupils. Others contacted local private school principals personally and even allowed the local non-public school principal to select pupils for participation in Title I. Still others recruited non-public school participants through discussions with non-public school personnel.

Some projects involved non-public school personnel in the original planning of the project, consulted constantly in regard to the aims of the program curriculum, and asked for specific recommendations regarding participants. While other projects made constructive and successful use of non-public school representatives in advisory capacities for their programs.

One project (North Attleboro, project #70-212-023) reported the provision of release time by the non-public school administration for their students to attend the public school. Approximately fifty (50) children from the non-public school are taught in integrated classes held by the project reading specialist in the public school.

Another project indicated that Title I has opened up channels of communication which affect other areas of education with the non-public schools besides the ones covered by the Title I project. For example the use of speech therapy in the public school for parochial school children; and the loaning of instructional media to the parochial school.

TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF  
MEMBERS AND EDUCATION AIDES

A breakdown of the types of staff training offered for Title I project personnel is presented in Table 8-1. Training for aides was carried out in ninety-two (92) projects, forty-seven percent (47%) of all those projects that included any type of staff training. Thirty percent (30%) of those projects conducted joint training sessions for teachers and the teacher aides who were to assist them.

Tables 8-2 through 8-5 summarize information on the time, intensity, leadership, and subject matter of Title I staff training programs. Over fifty percent (55.21%) of the personnel conducting staff training programs were Project Directors. The most frequent topics of staff programs were orientation to the Title I project (50.84%) and use of equipment and materials (49.83%). Fifty-eight percent (58%) of the time of staff training was conducted prior to and during the project operation. From one to fifteen hours of training was provided by seventy-one percent (71%) of the Title I projects offering training for their staff. Forty-seven percent (47%) of the projects offering training to staff provided this training for professional staff only and another forty-seven percent (47%) of the projects provided training for the aides.

TABLE 8-1  
Projects Providing Staff Training  
N = 195

Type of Staff Trained	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
1. Professional staff only	91	47%
2. Teacher Aides only	11	6%
3. Teachers and Aides separately	22	11%
4. Teachers and Aides jointly	59	30%
5. Sum of Projects with training for Aides (#2, #3, and #4)	92	47%
6. Other	12	6%
Total Project with Staff Training	195	
Percent of all Projects that provided Staff Training	65%	

TABLE 8-2

Time of Staff Training  
N = 210 Projects

Time	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
Prior to and during project	121	58%
Prior to project	31	15%
During the project	37	18%
Other	10	5%

TABLE 8-3

Number of Hours of Staff Training Received  
by Title I Staff Members  
N = 204 Projects

Hours	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
1-5 hours	46	23%
6-10 hours	56	27%
11-15 hours	42	21%
16-20 hours	23	11%
21-30 hours	12	6%
31-40 hours	9	4%
Over 40 hours	15	7%

TABLE 8-4  
Personnel Conducting Staff Training

Type of Personnel	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
Project Director	164	55.21%
Local Teachers and Staff Specialists	131	44.10%
Specialists from Colleges and Universities	46	15.48%
Specialists from Industry and/or the Arts	25	8.41%
Specialists in Medical and/or Psychological Services	72	24.24%
Others	26	8.75%

(These are duplicated counts many projects employed more than one type of personnel to conduct Title I Staff Training)

TABLE 8-5  
Topics of Title I Staff Programs

Topic of Program	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects
Orientation to the Title I Project	151	50.84%
Project Planning and Design	106	35.69%
Subject Matter Areas	129	43.43%
Development of Curriculum and Teaching Materials	134	45.11%
Use of Equipment and Materials	148	49.83%
Use of Supportive Services (Medical, Counseling, etc.)	105	35.35%
Culture and Psychology of Educationally Disadvantaged	62	20.87%
Diagnosis of Learning Disabilities	103	34.68%
Measurement, Evaluation and Reporting	137	46.12%
Use of Teacher Aides	89	29.96%
Other	17	5.72%

(These are duplicated counts since most programs were concerned with more than one topic)

One of the strongest programs was a series of ten in-service training sessions, devoted to various aspects of teaching reading, held for the Title I Reading Program in the Revere Public Schools. While this in-service program was designed specifically for teachers and support personnel in the Title I program, sessions were open to all teachers in the Revere schools. The in-service sessions were conducted by Dr. John Savage and Dr. Joseph Tremont of Boston College. Title I personnel were asked to indicate their concerns and professional needs regarding their instructional roles, and sessions were planned according to the topics indicated by the staff. Some of the topics discussed in the sessions were diagnostic and remedial techniques in reading, coordination and cooperation between remedial reading teachers and classroom teachers, using parents in the reading program, and learning disabilities. All of the in-service sessions were geared to seeking and exploring ways to improve the on-going instructional program in the Title I schools. Brainstorming, discussion, and sharing became part of each session. Along with formal information input, participants shared ideas and suggestions related to the instructional aspects of their program.



In-service training and preparation for Wellesley Project #70-317-280 was held before, during, and after student activities. The early meetings presented a description of the program, outlined some of the mechanics for the program and presented alternative learning models. Just prior to the commencement of the summer program, a group dynamics workshop was held for staff members and led by Mr. Razenn Baugh of Social Dynamics, Incorporated. One of the accomplishments of the workshop was to define explicitly the objectives of the program. During the course of the summer the in-service sessions were devoted to the pressing concerns of day-to-day activities and experiences and the mechanics for dealing with some of them. Towards the end of the program an additional session was led by Mr. Baugh and reflected on the effectiveness and weaknesses of the program as related to the ability of the staff to communicate in any depth.

## COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parents and other members of the community were involved in Title I activities in the following ways:

1. As members of Title I Advisory Committees
2. As Community Action Agency representatives
3. As representatives of other community organizations

### Title I Advisory Committees:

Of the school districts which responded to the District Report seventy-one percent (71%) indicated that they had the assistance of a local Title I Advisory Committee during the fiscal year 1970.

The functions of these committees are presented in Table 9-1. The three most frequent activities of the committees were reviewing plans developed by school personnel (83%), recommending direction for the LEA's total Title I program (74%), and identifying the needs of children to be served (64%).

The composition of the membership of these committees was reported for one hundred and eighty-eight (188) programs. This information is presented in Table 9-2. Sixty-five percent (65%) of the programs used public school administrators as members of their Advisory Committees, fifty-five

percent (55%) public school teachers, and fifty-three percent (53%) parents of public school children served by Title I projects.

TABLE 9-1  
Functions of Title I Advisory  
Committees  
N = 131 Programs

Function	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Recommending direction for the total Title I program	98	74%
Recommending direction for certain Title I projects	74	56%
Reviewing plans developed by school personnel	109	83%
Initiating plans for project activities	52	39%
Identifying the needs of children to be served	84	64%
Mobilizing personnel and community resources for Title I activities	44	33%
Disseminating information on Title I activities	59	45%
Evaluating Title I activities	65	49%
Participating in personnel policy decisions	29	22%

TABLE 9-2  
Membership of Title I Advisory  
Committees  
N = 188 Programs

Type of Member	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Parents of public school children served by Title I projects	100	53%
Parents of nonpublic school children served by Title I projects	35	18%
Parents of public school children not served by Title I projects	52	27%
Public school administrators	124	65%
Nonpublic school administrators	45	23%
Public school teachers	105	55%
Nonpublic school teachers	28	14%
School Committee Members	45	23%
Anti-poverty Program representa- tives (Headstart, Follow Through, Neighborhood Youth Corps, CAA.)	56	29%
Service Club representatives	8	4%
Students	6	3%
Others	43	22%

Ninety-five percent (95%) of the school districts utilizing a Title I Advisory Committee held at least one meeting in which all members of the Advisory Committee were asked to attend. The first meeting of an Advisory Committee for the fiscal year 1970 was held between April and December of 1969 by forty-eight percent (48%) of the programs and between January and June 1970 by forty-six percent (46%). Eighty-five percent (85%) of the school districts considered their experiences with an Advisory Committee as being successful.

Community Action Agencies:

Fifty-one percent (51%) of the Title I programs for the fiscal year 1970 were operated in communities where Community Action Agencies were active. Seventeen (17) programs did not involve the local Community Action Agency. A list of the ways in which Community Action Agencies assisted the local Title I programs is given in Table 9-3. The most frequent activities in which CAA members participated in Title I projects were in providing advice on project design and content, and in identifying the needs of children to be served.

TABLE 9-3  
Functions of Community  
Action Agencies  
N = 109 Programs

Functions	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Providing advice on project design and content	60	55%
Identifying the needs of children to be served by Title I projects	41	37%
Recruiting teacher aides	16	14%
Training teacher aides	2	1%
Providing other personnel	11	10%
Evaluating Title I activities	15	13%
Other	23	21%
<u>Not</u> involved in Title I programs	17	15%

#### Other Community Organizations

Some Title I projects were affiliated with local service organizations and other community resources. Table 9-4 summarizes the types of resources that were involved in Title I programs.

TABLE 9-4

Other Community Resources Involved  
in Title I Programs  
N = 188 Programs

Type of Resource	Number of Programs	Percent of Programs
Community Mental Health Services	63	33%
Community Public Health Services	55	29%
Private Clinics and Medical Resources	41	21%
United Fund Agencies	16	8%
Anti-Poverty Programs	24	12%
Local Service Clubs	21	11%
Local Business and Industry	30	15%
Local Museums and Cultural Organizations	58	30%
Other Resources	29	12%

One of the more interesting examples of parent involvement in Title I activities is found in the Homestart Summer 1970 Project conducted by the Haverhill School District (Project #128). The program was designed to provide opportunities for social, emotional, physical and intellectual

growth for thirty-two Homestart children. A weekly workshop session for Homestart parents was also planned as an ideal way to bring topical speakers and actively participating Homestart parents together. The workshops for Homestart parents were attempted after enthusiasm for the idea developed at a parents meeting. The speakers included a dental hygienist, two home economists, a speaker from Northern Essex County Association for Retarded children, representatives from TV's Sesame Street, a local pediatrician and a commercial art designer.

The workshops met on Wednesdays from July 15 through August 26. Parental attendance averaged between ten and fifteen, an encouraging number over such a long period. Children were brought to each session and attended to by Homestart staff members, older siblings and volunteers from the Neighborhood Youth Corps so parents could attend the workshops unencumbered.

The Homestart Summer 1970 Program was able to provide educational experiences to a number of preschoolers and interesting and informative discussions and workshops for parents.

Project #70-207-271 an early childhood education program for nursery, kindergarten children also made attempts



to involve parents in their program. Nearly 100% of the families with children enrolled in this program met with classroom teachers either at school or through home visits or via telephone. About one fourth (1/4) of the families participating in the above program took part in one or more of the program field trips.

A well - attended parent open house and picnic was held during the fifth and final week of the program. Parents visited and actively participated in the program on this date and then ate lunch with their children and the other children, parents and teachers of the program. While this represents a good beginning toward parent involvement the project evaluation has recommended that parents should have a related summer program that would make them more aware of child development and maturation levels and how to best meet problems and questions that come with these levels and are of concern to them.